

**REMARKS**

Applicants respectfully submit the present Substitute Preliminary Amendment following the personal interview between Examiner Graysay, Applicants, Applicants' attorney Mr. Burke, and Applicants' programmer, Mr. Escobar conducted on January 19, 2005. Applicants wish to extend their thanks to Examiner Graysay for the time and courtesy afforded to Applicants and their representatives during the personal interview. During that interview, claims 1 and 25, as amended, were discussed relative to the Ralston reference.

Applicants also discussed the following table which outlines aspects of Applicants' claimed invention, differences between those claimed aspects of Applicants' invention and the Ralston reference, and exemplary claims.

<b>Claimed Invention</b>	<b>Ralston</b>	<b>Applicable Claims</b>
Unrestricted access by the public service receivers.	Requires predetermined access code in order to see the service provider's schedule See Ralston Col. 4, lines 44-46.	1 et seq. 25 et seq.
Simple one step process	Ralston discloses a two-step process where SR inputs desire time for an appointment and system gets back to SR with appointment candidates. See Ralston Col. 3, lines 9-35.	

<b>Claimed Invention</b>	<b>Ralston</b>	<b>Applicable Claims</b>
Allows SR's to request standby appointments	Does not suggest allowing SR's to request standby appointments and then provide notice of whether the appointment opened up or is no longer available. The discussion in Ralston Col. 6, lines 56-64 regarding walk-in clients is only effective at the actual time of the appointments. On the contrary, the present invention makes provision for cancellation and rebooking of an appointment time slot.	11, 12, 13, 39-40
Integration of SR schedule with SP schedule to e.g., avoid conflicts.	The discussion in Col. 4, lines 47-57 regarding input of "client information" makes no suggestion of inputting the client's own personal schedule or for the schedule of a person related to the SR, e.g. son, daughter, etc.	16, et seq. 28, 44
Provision for SP's personal schedules	No teaching or suggestion of this in Ralston.	21
Plurality of SR's have access to each other's schedule.	No teaching of this or suggestion of this in Ralston.	23
Plurality of SP's have coded access to each other's schedules.	No teaching of this or suggestion of this in Ralston.	23
Provision for integrating the SR's schedule which is automatically updated when an appointment is made.	No teaching or suggestion of this in Ralston.	28
Competitors on same system	No teaching or suggestion of this in Ralston	34
Present system can require payment.	No suggestion or teaching in Ralston to <u>require</u> payment.	37-38

Support for the new dependent claims is on page 19, line 22- to page 21, line 3; page 22, lines 12-14. Please note the difference in the second line of claim 1 relative to the previously submitted Preliminary Amendment.

Lastly, Applicants also enclose an Information Disclosure Statement along with PTO Form 1449 in order to make the references cited in connection with the parent application of record in the present continuation application.

### **CONCLUSION**

Applicants respectfully submit that all pending claims as amended, are now in condition for allowance. Applicants wish to thank Examiner Graysay for her extended courtesy. If Examiner Graysay has any questions or comments which may expedite the prosecution of this application, she is respectfully requested to contact Applicants' attorney at the telephone number set forth below.

Dated: February 8, 2005

Respectfully submitted,



Daniel P. Burke, (30,735)  
GALGANO & BURKE, LLP  
Attorneys for Applicant  
300 Rabro Drive, Suite 135  
Hauppauge, NY 11788  
Telephone: 631 582-6161

F:\G&B\1363\2\1363-2CON\ReplyNonCompliance.wpd

-15-